

United States Department of the Interior

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Montana State Office

5001 Southgate Drive, P.O. Box 36800

Billings, Montana 59107-6800

<http://www.mt.blm.gov/>

In Reply To:
5200/8130/1610
(923)P

April 14, 2005

EMAIL TRANSMISSION – 4/14/05

Instruction Memorandum No. MT-2005-035

Expires: 9/30/06

To: Field Managers

From: Deputy State Director, Division of Resources

Subject: Data Request for Washington Office (WO) Instruction Memorandum (IM) No. 2005-110,
Meeting Healthy Forest Restoration Act Old-Growth Management and National Historic
Preservation Act Requirements **DD: May 2, 2005**

Attached is the above mentioned data request for WO IM No. 2005-110. We have also attached a template (Attachment 2) for you to provide the necessary information requested in the IM. Please have your Forestry, Cultural, and Planning Specialists coordinate a response to this request. In order to expedite this review, please send the completed template to Merry Prestridge in the Montana State Office with a cc to Jim Beaver, Bill Hensley, and Gary Smith by **COB Monday, May 2, 2005**.

If you have further questions concerning this matter, please feel free to contact Jim Beaver at (406) 896-5023.

Signed by: Randy D. Heuscher for Howard A. Lemm

Authenticated by: Merry Prestridge (MT923)

2 Attachments

1-WO IM No. 2005-110 (11 pp)

2-Response Template (2 pp)

Distribution

SOMT-1

Asst. FM Havre-1

Asst. FM Glasgow-1

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20240

March 16, 2005

In Reply Refer To:
5200 (WO-270) P
8130 (WO-240) P

EMS TRANSMISSION 03/25/2005
Instruction Memorandum No. 2005-110
Expires: 09/30/2006

To: State Directors

From: Assistant Director, Renewable Resources and Planning

Subject: Meeting Healthy Forests Restoration Act Old-Growth Management and
National Historic Preservation Act Requirements DD: 05/06/2005

Program Areas: Planning and Environmental Assessment, Forest and Woodland Management, Fuels Management, Range Management, Wildlife Management, and Cultural Resources.

Purposes: (1) Direction to review land use plans so that a comprehensive schedule to update them to include old growth forest and woodland management requirements as specified in the Healthy Forests Restoration Act (HFRA) can be developed. (2) Direction to review cultural resource information in land use plans so a comprehensive schedule for any necessary updates to that information can be developed. (3) Distribute information on existing old-growth forest definitions compiled by the National Science and Technology Center.

Policy/Action: (1) HFRA requires that the BLM and Forest Service “fully maintain, or contribute to the restoration of, the structure and composition of old-growth forest stands” when implementing projects under this authority. States shall review existing land use plan decisions and identify and prioritize land use plan amendments or revisions to incorporate old growth forest and woodland management direction that is consistent with HFRA Section 102(e)(2). Also, a comprehensive, prioritized state-wide list of plans that do not contain sufficient old growth management direction shall be submitted to WO-210 for incorporation into the 10-Year Planning Schedule. The submission should contain sufficient detail such that the state-wide lists can be prioritized on a national basis.

It is highly recommended that you review the *Healthy Forests Initiative and Healthy Forests Restoration Act Interim Field Guide*, located at <http://www.fs.fed.us/projects/hfi/field-guide/web/> for further guidance on the requirements in HFRA prior to beginning the review of existing land use plans.

(2) States shall review existing land use plans and identify and prioritize land use plan amendments or revisions to update cultural resource information, including consultation to identify properties that may be of traditional religious and cultural importance to an Indian tribe. A comprehensive, prioritized state-wide list of plans that require updates shall be submitted to WO-210 for incorporation into the 10-Year Planning Schedule. The submission should contain sufficient detail such that the state-wide lists can be prioritized on a national basis.

It is highly recommended that you review 8130 *Planning for Uses of Cultural Resources*, for further guidance on standards for cultural resource information in planning documents, and H-8120-1 *Guidelines for Conducting Tribal Consultation* for further guidance on tribal consultation.

Note: The States should submit one prioritized list of plans that requires updates for old growth and cultural resources (Items 1 and 2 above).

(3) Also, review the attached Old-Growth Definition paper developed by the National Science and Technology Center and identify issues regarding the use of these definitions and descriptions in incorporating old-growth management direction consistent with HFRA Section 102(e)(2) in land use plans where required. It is recommended that existing definitions of old growth developed by the Forest Service in the early 1990's be used in land use plan updates if applicable. In your response, as required above, please identify gaps in definitions for forest types contained within your jurisdiction, as well as other issues that may impede development of old-growth management direction consistent with HFRA language.

Background:

The Healthy Forests Restoration Act. The Healthy Forests Restoration Act (HFRA), enacted on December 3, 2003, provides unique authority for conducting hazardous fuels reduction and forest health improvement treatments on 20 million acres of Federal land. HFRA serves to aid in the implementation of the goals of the National Fire Plan, the 10-year Comprehensive Strategy Implementation Plan and the President's Healthy Forest Initiative. Title I of the HFRA authorizes projects in one or more of the following areas:

- Wildland Urban Interface areas of at-risk communities
- Municipal watersheds that are at risk from wildland fire
- Areas where windthrow, blowdown, ice storm damage, or where insects or disease epidemics significantly threaten resource values
- Areas where wildland fire poses a threat to T&E Species or their habitat.

HFRA contains a variety of provisions aimed at expediting the preparation and implementation of fuels reduction and forest restoration projects on specific types of at-risk Federal land.

In addition of these provisions, HFRA contains a requirement to “fully maintain, or contribute to the restoration of” old-growth forest stands when implementing “covered” projects. “Covered” projects include all projects authorized under HFRA, except those authorized due to the threat posed by windthrow, blowdown, ice storm damage, or insect or disease epidemics.

HFRA also requires that any actions to revise or amend existing old-growth management direction contained in land use plans must be consistent with the above requirement to maintain and restore old-growth forest stands for the purpose of carrying out projects “covered” by HFRA. The BLM Land Use Planning Handbook, H-1601-1 is currently being updated to reflect this requirement.

Where land use plans containing older old-growth management direction (pre December 15, 1993), or where plans contain no old-growth management direction, HFRA requires review of these plans to determine whether additional plan direction is needed for covered projects within old-growth forest stands to meet the “fully maintain, or contribute towards the restoration of” old-growth forest stands requirement. If this plan review, adequacy determination, and incorporation of adequate old-growth management direction (if necessary) are not completed within the required timeframe, fuels treatment projects using HFRA authorities may not proceed in old-growth forest stands if someone provides “substantial supporting evidence” during scoping that the areas proposed for treatment include old-growth forest stands.

The National Historic Preservation Act and E.O. 13287 Preserve America. NHPA section 110 (16 U.S.C. 470h-2) requires federal agencies to manage and maintain properties under their jurisdiction or control that are listed on or may be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (National Register), in a way that considers the preservation of their historic, archaeological, architectural and cultural values. It further requires that the preservation of properties not under the jurisdiction or control of the agency but subject to be potentially affected by agency actions, be given full consideration in planning. Agencies’ preservation-related activities are carried out in consultation with other Federal, State, and local agencies, Indian tribes, and the private sector.

NHPA Section 106 (16 U.S.C. 470f) requires agencies having direct or indirect jurisdiction over a proposed Federal or federally assisted undertaking, take into account the effect of the undertaking on any property that is included in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register.

The March 3, 2003 Executive Order 13287 *Preserve America* orders agencies to maximize their efforts to integrate the policies, procedures, and practices of the NHPA and this order into their program activities in order to efficiently and effectively advance historic preservation objectives in the pursuit of their missions. It makes the point that accurate information on the state of federally owned historic properties is essential to achieving the goals of the order.

Current information on cultural resources in a planning area, including properties that may be of traditional religious and cultural importance to an Indian tribe, is a crucial element in developing plan alternatives, in land use decision-making and in considering potential impacts of proposed planning and implementation decisions for the purposes of NHPA Sections 106 and the National Environmental Policy Act. Implementation decisions in land use and other planning documents may be undertakings with the potential to affect cultural resources for the purposes of NHPA Section 106. This IM requests information to assist BLM in identifying and prioritizing planning requirements.

Impact on Budget: Implementing this request has minimal short term budget implications. However, there will be an expense with updating land use plans. In the long run, including old growth direction in land use plans is expected to increase the efficiency of treating hazardous fuels under the HFRA and of NHPA Section 106 compliance for landscape level implementation decisions.

Coordination: This IM was coordinated with the Planning, Assessment and Community Support (WO-210), Forest and Woodland Management (WO-270), the Office of Fire and Aviation, Planning and Resources (FA-620), Rangeland Resources (WO-220), Fish, Wildlife and Botany (WO-230), National Science and Technology Center (ST-131), and Cultural and Fossil Resources and Tribal Consultation (WO-240).

Contact: Additional information is available by contacting Elroy Masters, Planning and Environmental Analyst, at (202) 452-7717, Rick Tholen, Forest Health Program Manager, at (208) 387-5321, Tom Roberts, Natural Resource Specialist, at (303) 236-0586, or Robin Burgess, Federal Preservation Officer, at (202) 785-6581.

Signed by:
Peter J. Ditton
Acting Assistant Director
Renewable Resources and Planning

Authenticated by:
Barbara J. Brown
Policy & Records Group, WO-560

1 Attachment
1- Old-Growth Definitions (7 pp)

Old-Growth Definitions

The National Science and Technology Center (NSTC) have developed information on definitions of old-growth forest conditions that may assist field offices in developing management direction that meets the intent of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act (HFRA). HFRA, Section 102(e)(2), requires the Forest Service and BLM, when carrying out covered projects using HFRA authority, to “fully maintain, or contribute towards the restoration of, the structure and composition of old-growth stands ...contributing to old-growth structure.” Descriptions of pre-fire exclusion old-growth conditions for most forest types were developed by the Forest Service in the early 1990s. However, there may be forest cover types where pre-fire exclusion old-growth conditions have not been described in sufficient detail to be used to define old-growth conditions or to develop management direction. NSTC has identified some of these “gaps” in old-growth forest descriptions. The following two tables illustrate the availability of information pertaining to old-growth forest descriptions by Society of American Foresters (SAF) forest cover type. The first table and explanatory paragraphs show information available and its applicability to BLM, by State. The second table illustrates a further evaluation into how well those definitions of old growth may meet the needs of BLM with respect to the HFRA requirement of “pre-fire suppression old-growth conditions”.

Old-growth Definitions Table

We identified the status of information by region, definitions, cover types, and status.

In the early 1990s, the Forest Service embarked on an effort to establish ecological definitions of old-growth for each forest cover type described in the SAF Cover Types of the United States and Canada. Each Forest Service Region developed draft definitions pertaining to the forest cover types within its boundaries. They began with a somewhat generic definition (USDA Forest Service, 1990) as follows:

Old-growth Forests are ecosystems distinguished by old trees and related structural features. Old-growth encompasses the later stages of stand development that typically differ from earlier stages in several ways including tree size; accumulations of large dead, woody material; number of canopy layers; species composition; and ecosystem function.

This has been interpreted to mean old-growth is typically distinguished by the following:

1. Large size trees of specific species,
2. Wide variation in age classes and stocking levels,
3. Accumulations of large-size dead standing and fallen trees,
4. Decadence in the form of broken or deformed tops and boles,
5. Multiple canopy layers,
6. Canopy interspaces and under story patchiness.

Five structural attributes were identified for Regional consideration in developing minimum criteria for old-growth determination, with not all of them needing to be defined. The attributes were live trees in the main canopy, variation in tree diameters, dead trees, tree decadence, and number of tree canopies criteria. The Regions could also add optional attributes if they were considered important in determining old-growth.

The table below illustrates the presence or absence of information, SAF Cover Types described and states encompassed within Forest Service regional boundaries. The Cover Type descriptions not available were determined by examining the Cover Types available with a list of Forest Inventory and Analysis Cover Types found on BLM managed lands. However, it was difficult to correlate the Region 1 descriptions with the SAF Cover Types with the cover type descriptions they supplied and the closest fit was used. The major gap or cover type descriptions not available are the juniper and oak types. BLM also has a mesquite cover type in Arizona, which does not have an old-growth description available either. As noted in the Cover Type description Not Available column, some work has been done in Region 6 on old-growth western juniper, by Waichler, et al, but in general, information on these types either by SAF Cover Types or FIA Cover Types is lacking. In the review, it was also noted that the FIA Cover Type descriptions are more discrete than the SAF Cover Types.

Forest Service Region	Descriptions and references	Cover Type Description Available, as defined by the Forest Service	Cover Type Description Not Available	States
Region 1	See Green, et al, below.	SAF Cover Type 205 Mountain Hemlock, SAF Cover Type 206 Engelmann Spruce-Subalpine Fir, SAF Cover Type 208 Whitebark Pine, SAF Cover Type 210 Douglas Fir, SAF Cover Type 212 Western Larch, SAF Cover Type 213 Grand Fir, SAF Cover Type 215 Western White Pine, SAF Cover Type 218 Lodgepole Pine, SAF Cover Type 219 Limber Pine, SAF Cover Type 224 Western Hemlock, SAF Cover Type 228 Western Red Cedar, SAF Cover Type 237 Ponderosa Pine.	SAF Cover Type 217 Aspen (addressed in Region 2), SAF Cover Type 220 Rocky Mountain Juniper.	Northern Idaho, Montana, North Dakota.
Region 2	See Mehl, below.	SAF Cover Type 206 Spruce-fir, SAF Cover Type 210 Douglas-fir, SAF Cover Type 217 Aspen, SAF Cover Type 218 Lodgepole pine, SAF Cover type 237 Interior Ponderosa Pine (Front Range), SAF Cover Type 237 Interior Ponderosa Pine (Black Hills), SAF Cover Type 237 Ponderosa Pine (Southwest), SAF Cover Type 239 Pinyon-juniper	SAF Cover Type 208 Whitebark pine (covered in Region 1), SAF Cover Type 219 Limber pine (addressed in Region 4), SAF Cover Type 220 Rocky Mountain Juniper	Colorado, Wyoming South Dakota.

Region 3	See below.	SAF Cover Type 206 Engelmann Spruce-subalpine fir, SAF Cover Type 217 Aspen, SAF Cover Type 237 Ponderosa Pine, SAF Cover Type 239 Pinyon-juniper, Mixed-species Group Forest Cover Types, (including SAF Cover Type 210 Douglas-fir, SAF Cover Type 211 White fir, SAF Cover Type 216 Blue spruce, and SAF Cover Type 219 Limber pine)	SAF Cover Type 220 Rocky Mountain Juniper.	Arizona, New Mexico.
Region 4	See Hamilton, below.	SAF Cover Type 206 Engelmann spruce –subalpine fir, SAF Cover Type 208 Whitebark pine, SAF Cover Type 209 Bristlecone pine, SAF Cover Type 210 Interior Douglas-fir, SAF Cover Type 216 Blue spruce, SAF Cover type 217 Aspen , SAF Cover Type 218 Lodgepole pine, SAF Cover Type 219 Limber pine, SAF Cover Type 237 Interior ponderosa pine- (Northern Plateau Race), SAF Cover Type 237 Interior ponderosa pine (Rocky Mountain Race), SAF Cover Type 239 Pinyon juniper	SAF Cover Type 220 Rocky Mountain Juniper, SAF Cover Type 223 Jeffery Pine, SAF Cover Type 235 Cottonwood Willow.	Southern Idaho, Nevada, Utah, western Wyoming.
Region 5	See below, for more information Marcot, et al, below.	SAF Cover Type 207 Red Fir, SAF Cover Type 211 White Fir, SAF Cover Type 218 Lodgepole Pine, SAF Cover Type 229 Pacific Douglas Fir, SAF Cover Type 232 Coast Redwood, SAF Cover Type 234 Douglas Fir/ Tanoak/Madrone, SAF Cover Type 237 Interior Ponderosa Pine, SAF Cover Type 243 Mixed Conifer, SAF Cover Type 245 Pacific Ponderosa Pine, SAF Cover Type 247 Jeffery Pine, SAF Cover Type 256 California Mixed Subalpine Forests.	SAF Cover Type 239 Pinyon juniper, SAF Cover Type 233 Oregon White Oak, SAF Cover Type 238 Western juniper, SAF Cover Type 246 California Black Oak, SAF Cover Type 249 Canyon Live Oak	California

Region 6	See below.	SAF Cover Type 206 Engelmann spruce- subalpine fir, SAF Cover Type 210 Interior Douglas –fir, SAF Cover Type 211 White fir, SAF Cover Type 213 Grand fir, SAF Cover Type 218 Lodgepole pine, SAF Cover Type 224 Western hemlock, SAF 226 Cover Type Coastal true fir- hemlock, SAF Cover Type 229 Pacific Douglas-fir, SAF Cover Type 231 Port-Orford –cedar, SAF Cover Type 232 Redwood, SAF Cover Type 234 Douglas fir – tanoak- Pacific madrone, SAF Cover Type 237 Ponderosa pine	SAF Cover Type 207 Red Fir, SAF Cover Type 238 Western Juniper, as described by Waichler, et al, below.	Oregon, Washington
Region 10	See Capp, et al below.	SAF Cover Type 201 White Spruce, SAF Cover Type 204 Black Spruce, SAF Cover Type 205 Mountain Hemlock, SAF Cover Type 217 Aspen, SAF Cover Type 223 Sitka Spruce, SAF Cover Type 224 Western Hemlock		Alaska

Old-Growth Table with Fire Column (or pre-settlement old-growth conditions)

The following table identifies old-growth descriptions, by Region and SAF Forest Cover Type, that describe a set of characteristics expected to occur before settlement in the western U.S. Most of the old-growth descriptions do not explicitly describe “pre-settlement” old-growth conditions. It is believed that some descriptions can be applied today in that they address the conditions; such as stocking, age, etc; as they would be in a pre-settlement old-growth forest. Most of the old-growth descriptions do not explicitly describe “pre-settlement” old-growth conditions.

A few descriptions, such as the southwestern ponderosa pine description in Region 3, discuss the role of fire in old-growth development; therefore, one can conclude that those descriptions are for conditions before the influence of settlement and fire suppression.

The Region 5 and Region 6 descriptions are clearly identifying conditions existing today that they consider old-growth. Their old-growth descriptions identify “average” characteristics of ecologically old stands, or stands beyond maturity in timber management terms. The descriptions include the effects any human influences on the forest. They do not describe a pre-settlement condition.

Each old-growth description is judged on its application to a pre-settlement or pre-fire suppression condition. In the case of the dry forest types the description had to include discussion of the effects of fire and fire return interval on old-growth stands to receive a “yes” rating. In higher elevation, more wet, forest types, fire is generally a stand replacing event which reverts the stand to an earlier seral stage or even causes a forest type conversion. The

descriptions for those forest types received a “yes” rating. When in doubt as to the role of fire or where the description is vague about the influence of fire suppression, a “no” rating was given.

Forest Service Region	Descriptions and references	Cover type Description Available, as defined by the Forest Service	Addresses Fire (Yes/No)
Region 1	See Green, et al, below.	SAF Cover Type 205 Mountain Hemlock SAF Cover Type 206 Engelmann Spruce – Subalpine Fir SAF Cover Type 208 Whitebark Pine SAF Cover Type 210 Douglas Fir SAF Cover Type 212 Western Larch SAF Cover Type 213 Grand Fir SAF Cover Type 215 Western White Pine SAF Cover Type 218 Lodgepole Pine SAF Cover Type 219 Limber Pine SAF Cover Type 224 Western Hemlock SAF Cover Type 228 Western Red Cedar SAF Cover Type 237 Ponderosa Pine	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes
Region 2	See Mehl, below.	SAF Cover Type 206 Spruce-fir SAF Cover Type 210 Douglas-fir SAF Cover Type 217 Aspen SAF Cover Type 218 Lodgepole pine SAF Cover Type 237 Interior Ponderosa Pine (Front Range) SAF Cover Type 237 Interior Ponderosa Pine (Black Hills) SAF Cover Type 237 Ponderosa Pine (Southwest) SAF Cover Type 239 Pinyon-juniper	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes
Region 3	See below.	SAF Cover Type 206 Engelmann Spruce-subalpine fir SAF Cover Type 217 Aspen SAF Cover Type 237 Ponderosa Pine SAF Cover Type 239 Pinyon-juniper Mixed-species Group Forest Cover Types, (including SAF Cover Type 210 Douglas-fir, SAF Cover Type 211 White fir SAF Cover Type 216 Blue spruce, and SAF Cover Type 219 Limber pine)	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes
Region 4	See Hamilton, below.	SAF Cover Type 206 Engelmann spruce – subalpine fir SAF Cover Type 208 Whitebark pine SAF Cover Type 209 Bristlecone pine SAF Cover Type 210 Interior Douglas-fir SAF Cover Type 216 Blue spruce	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes

		SAF Cover Type 217 Aspen SAF Cover Type 218 Lodgepole pine SAF Cover Type 219 Limber pine SAF Cover Type 237 Interior ponderosa pine- (Northern Plateau Race) SAF Cover Type 237 Interior ponderosa pine (Rocky Mountain Race) SAF Cover Type 239 Pinyon juniper	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes
Region 5	See below, also see Marcot, et al below.	SAF Cover Type 207 Red Fir SAF Cover Type 211 White Fir SAF Cover Type 218 Lodgepole Pine SAF Cover Type 229 Pacific Douglas Fir SAF Cover Type 232 Coast Redwood SAF Cover Type 234 Douglas Fir/ Tanoak/Madrone SAF Cover Type 237 Interior Ponderosa Pine SAF Cover Type 243 Mixed Conifer SAF Cover Type 245 Pacific Ponderosa Pine SAF Cover Type 247 Jeffery Pine SAF Cover Type 256 California Mixed Subalpine Forests.	Yes No Yes No No No No No No No No
Region 6	See below.	SAF Cover Type 206 Engelmann spruce- subalpine fir SAF Cover Type 210 Interior Douglas –fir SAF Cover Type 211 White fir SAF Cover Type 213 Grand fir SAF Cover Type 218 Lodgepole pine SAF Cover Type 224 Western hemlock SAF Cover Type 226 Coastal true fir- hemlock, SAF Cover Type 229 Pacific Douglas-fir SAF Cover Type 231 Port-Orford –cedar SAF Cover Type 232 Redwood SAF Cover Type 234 Douglas fir – tanoak- Pacific madrone SAF Cover Type 237 Ponderosa pine	Yes Yes No No Yes Yes No Yes No No No Yes Yes
Region 10	See Capp, et al below.	SAF Cover Type 201 White Spruce SAF Cover Type 204 Black Spruce SAF Cover Type 205 Mountain Hemlock SAF Cover Type 217 Aspen SAF Cover Type 223 Sitka Spruce SAF Cover Type 224 Western Hemlock	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes

The following references provide more detailed information on old-growth forest descriptions for cover types typically present on BLM managed lands. However, it should be noted that much of this information was developed before the advent of easily transferable data and consequently is only partially available electronically. In some Forest Service Regions the information is posted on a website or it may be available at NSTC electronically. In other instances, the information is available only in hard copy either at NSTC or through the Forest Service Regional or other offices.

Capp, J., B. Van Zee, P. Alaback, J. Boughton, M. Copenhagen, J. Martin. 1992. Final Report, Ecological Definitions for Old-Growth Forest Types in the Alaska Region. Prepared by the Ecology Steering Committee, USDA Forest Service Alaska Region. **(Region 10)**

Green, P., J. Joy, D. Sirucek, W. Hann, A. Zack, and B. Naumann. 1992. Old-Growth Forest Types of the Northern Region. USDA Forest Service, Northern Region, Missoula, MT. **(Region 1)**

Hamilton, R.G., compiler, 1993. Characteristics of Old-Growth Forests in the Intermountain Region. USDA Forest Service Intermountain Region, Ogden Utah. **(Region 4)**

Marcot, B.G., R.S.Holthausen, J.Teply, and W.D. Carrirer. 1991. Old-Growth Inventories: Status, Definitions, and Visions for the Future, in Wildlife and Vegetation of Unmanaged Douglas-Fir Forests, USDA Forest Service Pacific Northwest Research Station General Technical Report PNW-GTR-285, May 1991. **(Regions 5, 6)**

Mehl, Mel S. 1992. Old-Growth Descriptions for the Major Forest Cover Types in the Rocky Mountain Region, In: Kaufmann, M.R., W.H. Moir, and R.L. Bassett, technical coordinators, Old-Growth Forests in the Southwest and Rocky Mountain Regions: Proceedings of a Workshop. USDA Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Experiment Station, Fort Collins, CO. General Technical Report RM 213. **(Region 2)**

Floyd, Lisa M. 2003 Ancient Piñon-Juniper Woodlands: A Natural History of Mesa Verde Country. University Press of Colorado. Boulder, Colorado.

USDA Forest Service, Southwestern Region. 1992. Recommended Old-Growth Definitions and Descriptions and Old-Growth Allocation Procedure. **(Region 3)**

USDA Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region. 1992. Old Growth Definitions/Characteristics for Eleven Forest Cover Types. Pacific Southwest Region, San Francisco, CA. **(Region 5)**

USDA Forest Service. 1993. Region 6 interim old growth definitions for the Douglas-fir series, grand fir/white fir series, interior Douglas-fir series, lodgepole pine series, Pacific silver fir series, ponderosa pine series, Port Orford cedar series, tanoak (redwood) series, western hemlock series. USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Region, Portland, OR. **(Region 6)**

Waichler, W.S., R.F. Miller, and P.S.Doescher. 2001. Community characteristics of old-growth western juniper woodlands. Journal of Range Management, 54:518-527.

Bureau of Land Management
Land Use Plan Review Template
for
Old Growth Management & National Historic Preservation Act
May 2005

Purpose: This Land Use Plan review template offers a consistent approach to review and document land use allocations, land health condition objectives, and mitigation for all program activities to determine the adequacy in identifying and managing old growth vegetation and managing/maintaining properties that are listed or may be eligible for the national Register of Historic Places. (Requested by WO Instruction Memorandum No. 2005-110)

Guidance:

1. An interdisciplinary team will use information gathered in the review to make a YES/NO adequacy determination for each existing land use plan. If a new Draft RMP is underway, field offices are encouraged to also apply the review to the draft document.

Instructions for answering review questions:

1. Land Use Plans are viewed as a “regulatory mechanism”, for that reason, the questions pertain to the written management direction in a BLM Land Use Plan (LUP), Resource Management Plan (RMP), an amendment to the Plan, or Management Framework Plan (MFP). If policies or strategies exist for management of old growth or management of the National Historic Preservation Act, but have not been incorporated through amendment, plan revision or plan maintenance, they should not be used to answer the questions.
2. Please answer all the questions. Write N/A if it does not apply.
3. For each question where you answer “yes”, disclose the page numbers of the plan from which you based your answer.

General Information

1. Land Use Planning Area _____
2. Date of your current land use planning document _____

3. Name and dates of all amendments _____
4. Scheduled date for revision or amending _____
5. Name of person(s) completing questionnaire _____

Question	YES	NO	N/A	Page numbers and/or Comment
<i>OLD GROWTH MANAGEMENT</i>				
Does the Land Use Plan define Old Growth? If “Yes” please provide the definition used in the Comment Section				
Does the Land Use Plan identify Old Growth areas?				
Is there any management activities planned in the identified Old Growth areas?				
Will these management activities “Fully Maintain” or contribute towards the restoration of the Old Growth in these areas?				
Does the management activity intend to use the authorities provided in the Healthy Forests Restoration Act to implement the decision in these Old Growth Areas?				
<i>NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT</i>				
Does the plan comport with the principles and standards for cultural resource planning identified in BLM Manual 8130 (Released 12/03/2004)? If it does not, list the principles or standards it does not meet, e.g. tribal consultation, in the Comment section.				